

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORLANDO MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-0557 DFL JFM P

vs.

ALVARO C. TRAQUINA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action for relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 10, 2006, plaintiff filed a document styled "Objection to Defendants Reply to Second Amended Complaint & Request for Qualified Immunity." The court construes this document as a reply to defendants' answers to plaintiff's second amended complaint.

Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides as follows:

There shall be a complaint and an answer; a reply to a counterclaim denominated as such; an answer to a cross-claim, if the answer contains a cross-claim; a third-party complaint, if a person who was not an original party is summoned under the provisions of Rule 14; and a third-party answer, if a third-party complaint is served. No other pleading shall be allowed, except that the court may order a reply to an answer or a third-party answer.

////

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a) (emphasis added). The court has not ordered plaintiff to reply to defendants'  
2 answer and declines to make such an order.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's March 10, 2006  
4 "Objection to Defendants Reply to Second Amended Compliant & Request for Qualified  
5 Immunity" shall be disregarded.

6 DATED: May 24, 2006.

7  
8   
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 12  
11 mart0557.77e  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26